

Customer No.: 31561  
Application No.: 10/711,679  
Docket No.: 13838-US-PA

### REMARKS

This is a full and timely response to the outstanding nonfinal Office Action mailed April 06, 2006. Applicant submits that claims 1 and 4 have been amended hereby. Support to the changes of the claims can be found in the previously presented claims, disclosure and the drawings. Specifically, the changes can be found in FIGS. 1-3, in which it is clearly illustrated that each of the first and second LED dies has a first electrode and a second electrode, and the first electrode of the first LED die and the first electrode of the second LED die are electrically connected, and also the second electrode of the first LED die and the second electrode of the second LED die are also electrically connected. Reconsideration and allowance of the application and presently pending claims 1-13 are respectfully requested.

### Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102

The Office Action rejected claims 1-3, 6 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Shimizu et al. (US 2002/0070681).

In response to the rejection to claims 1-3, 6 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Shimizu et al. (US 2002/0070681), Applicant has amended claim 1, and hereby otherwise traverse this rejection. As such, Applicant submits that claims 1-3 and 6 are now in condition for allowance.

With respect to claim 1, as originally filed, recites in part:

A white LED device, comprising:

Customer No.: 31561  
Application No.: 10/711,679  
Docket No.: 13838-US-PA

...  
an electrode connection structure, ... the first electrode of the first LED die and the first electrode of the second LED die are electrically connected, and the second electrode of the first LED die and the second electrode of the second LED die are electrically connected  
... (Emphasis added)

Applicants submit that such a white LED device, as set forth in claim 1 is neither taught, disclosed, nor suggested by Shimizu et al. or any of the other cited references, taken alone or in combination.

Shimizu et al. fails to disclose, teach or suggest "an electrode connection structure, ... the first electrode of the first LED die and the first electrode of the second LED die are electrically connected, and the second electrode of the first LED die and the second electrode of the second LED die are electrically connected" as set forth in claim 1 (Emphasis added). Shimizu et al. teaches, in FIG. 1, two LEDs 11 and 12, each having two electrodes. An electrode of LED 11 is electrically connected with an electrode of LED 12. However, the other electrode of LED 11 is electrically connected to 14b, and the other electrode of LED 12 is electrically connected with 14c, while 14b and 14c are not electrically connected. Therefore, Shimizu et al. fails to disclose, teach or suggest each and every limitations of claim 1, as currently amended, and claim 1 and its dependent claims 2, 3 and 6 are submitted to be novel and

Customer No.: 31561  
Application No.: 10/711,679  
Docket No.: 13838-US-PA

unobvious over Shimizu et al., and any of the other cited references, taken alone or in combination, and should be allowed.

**Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 4, 5, 7, 8-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Shimizu et al in view of Suenaga (US 2004/0120155).

In response to the rejections to claims 4, 5, 7, 8-12 under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Shimizu et al in view of Suenaga, Applicant submits that claim 4 has been amended, and claims 4, 5, 7, 8-12 depend on allowable independent claim 1, thus should also be allowable.

Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Shimizu et al in view of Chang et al. (TW546854).

Applicant submits that claim 9 depends on allowable independent claim 1, thus should also be allowable.

Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Shimizu et al and Suenaga, as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Wang et al. (US 2006/0028122).

Applicant submits that claim 13 depends on allowable independent claim 1, thus should also be allowable.

Customer No.: 31561  
Application No.: 10/711,679  
Docket No.: 13838-US-PA

**CONCLUSION**

For at least the foregoing reasons, it is believed that the pending claims 1-13 are in proper condition for allowance and an action to such effect is earnestly solicited. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference would expedite the examination of the above-identified patent application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned.

Date : *June 8, 2006*

Respectfully submitted,

  
Belinda Lee

Registration No.: 46,863

Jianq Chyun Intellectual Property Office  
7<sup>th</sup> Floor-1, No. 100  
Roosevelt Road, Section 2  
Taipei, 100  
Taiwan  
Tel: 011-886-2-2369-2800  
Fax: 011-886-2-2369-7233  
Email: belinda@jicpgroup.com.tw ;  
usa@jicpgroup.com.tw